

CALVIN TANKESLY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	NO. 1:20-cv-00017
)	
ARAMARK SERVICES, INC. et al.,)	JUDGE CAMPBELL
)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES
Defendants.)	

Pending before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 53), which was filed on June 30, 2021. Through the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Plaintiff’s motion for an injunction (Doc. No. 48) be denied. The Court received Objections from Plaintiff (Doc. No. 55) on July 12, 2021. For the reasons discussed below, the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved.


A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the

balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Nat'l Resources Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's motion be denied because she found that Plaintiff had not demonstrated a strong or substantial likelihood of success on the merits, the balancing of harms did not weigh in favor of Plaintiff's requested relief, and that Plaintiff had not persuasively demonstrated that a public interest would be advanced by his requested relief. (*See* Doc. No. 53 at PageID # 672).

Plaintiff disagrees with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that his motion for injunctive relief be denied. (Doc. No. 55). Plaintiff does not argue that the Magistrate Judge erred in her statement of the law. Nor does Plaintiff argue that the Magistrate Judge erred in finding that he had not demonstrated the balancing of harms weighed in favor of the requested relief or that he not demonstrated that a public interest would be advanced by the requested relief. (*Id.* at PageID # 678-79). Rather, Plaintiff appears to object to the Magistrate Judge's finding that he had not demonstrated a strong or substantial likelihood of success on the merits of his action, arguing that this factor cannot be determined until he is given the benefit of non-interference by the defendants. (*Id.* at at PageID # 678). The Court finds that the Magistrate Judge did not err in her finding that Plaintiff failed to demonstrate a strong or substantial likelihood of success on the merits. Plaintiff's remaining objections fail to provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation.

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for an injunction (Doc. No. 48) is **DENIED**, and Plaintiff's Motion to Revisit Motion for Injunction (Doc. No. 81) is **DENIED** as moot.

It is so **ORDERED**.


WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE